

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 8, 2006 in which all of pending claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-26 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 15 are amended. Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-26 are presented for reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is noted that claims 27-30 were previously canceled, so the rejection of claims 27-30 is not addressed in substance. As a basis for rejection of all pending claims, the Office Action stated that the rejected claims do not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. With this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 15 are amended to clearly recite a useful, concrete and tangible result.

In section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Applicant's arguments had been fully considered but that they were not persuasive. The basis for this position in the Office Action was stated to be that:

The final result produced by the invention is still not outputted (stored in memory, displayed or provided to an outside device) from the system, which means that no change is being produced in the system or no use can be given to the result provided by the invention disclosed. As stated above in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101, for a claimed invention to be statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101, the claims must have the FINAL RESULT (not the steps) produce a useful (specific, substantial, AND credible), concrete (substantially repeatable/non-unpredictable), AND tangible (real world/non-abstract) result.

Therefore, with this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 15 are amended such that the final result is clearly useful, concrete and tangible. Specifically, independent claim 1 is amended to recite that “the machine learning component updates the training data by mapping the particular query entry to the suggested best guess task to provide updated training data and stores the updated training data in the training data store. Independent claim 15 is amended to recite the further step of “storing the updated training data in memory”. Since the Office Action described storing of the final result as being an output of the final result required for a claim to be statutory,

it is believed that these amendments to independent claims 1 and 15 should overcome the rejections of all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101. It is also respectfully submitted that these amendments to claims 1 and 15 do not raise new issues which would require a further search by the Examiner, and therefore this Amendment After Final should be entered. Entry of this Amendment After Final and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In section 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-16 and 18-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,606). Since claims 4 and 16 were previously canceled, the rejection of these claims is not addressed in substance. For at least the following reasons, the rejection of the pending claims as being anticipated by Fries et al. (hereafter Fries) is respectfully traversed. As will be demonstrated, each independent claim includes at least one limitation which is neither taught nor suggested by Fries (or by the other cited references).

In rejecting claims 1 and 15, the Office Action stated that Fries et al. (hereafter Fries) anticipates an annotating system for aiding users in performing bulk mapping of queries to tasks to obtain training data for training a search component. While Fries does teach search components, methods of enhancing query interfaces, and methods of identifying a topic of a search, Fries does not teach an annotating system or method for aiding a user in performing bulk mapping of queries to tasks to obtain training data for training a search component. The present invention, as claimed, is useful in obtaining training data for training search components such as the one disclosed by Fries.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an annotating system for aiding a user in performing bulk mapping of queries to tasks to update training data for training a search component. The annotating system of claim 1 includes “a graphical user interface generating component which simultaneously displays multiple query entries of the plurality of query entries in the query log and multiple tasks of the plurality of tasks in the task list in a manner which associates the

suggested best guess query-to-task mappings”. This limitation, addressing a feature of the annotating system which facilitates the performance of bulk mapping of queries to tasks, is not taught or suggested in the cited search component art.

In rejecting independent claim 1, the Office Action stated that this graphical user interface limitation is taught by Fries at col. 5, lines 52-65; col. 8, lines 62-67; col. 9, lines 1-38; col. 23, lines 1-50; and in FIGS. 7A-7C and 18. Also in support of the position that Fries teaches this claim limitation, the Office Action stated that, in Fries, “the query entry is displayed along with the suggestions (query to task mapping). The pull down menu displays simultaneously the queries and the list of past searches (task list)”. Further, in the response to Applicant’s arguments, in section 9 of the Office Action the Examiner stated that in Figure 7B of Fries, “the user is able to select a past search query stored in the log. Once he selects a past search, the suggestions will be displayed to the user.”

The assertion that these portions of Fries teach or suggest the claim limitation of “a graphical user interface generating component which simultaneously displays multiple query entries of the plurality of query entries in the query log and multiple tasks of the plurality of tasks in the task list in a manner which associates the suggested best guess query-to-task mappings” is respectfully traversed. Fries does not teach the limitation of the graphical user interface generating component “simultaneously displaying multiple query entries of the plurality of queries entries in the query log and multiple tasks of the plurality of tasks in the task list”. Further, Fries does not teach this simultaneous display of multiple query entries and multiple tasks “in a manner which associates the suggested best guess query-to-task mappings”.

While drop down menus of Fries may teach simultaneous display of a query entry and multiple tasks, it does not teach the simultaneous display of multiple query entries of the plurality of queries entries in the query log and multiple tasks of the plurality of tasks in the task list in a manner which associates the suggested best guess query-to-task mappings. See for example Fries at FIG. 7B and col. 9, lines 5-15 which describe a pull-down window 252 displaying an input query and a selectable list of past search queries entered by the user. The Office Action refers to this selectable list of past searches as the “task list”. Using this interpretation, Fries teaches the

simultaneous display of a single query entry and multiple tasks, but not the simultaneous display of multiple query entries and multiple tasks. Likewise, if the Office Action interprets a list of past searches entered by the user as query entries, then Fries could be considered to teach the display of multiple query entries, but not the simultaneous display of multiple associated tasks. The claim limitation of the simultaneous display of “multiple query entries of the plurality of query entries in the query log and multiple tasks of the plurality of tasks in the task list in a manner which associates the suggested best guess query-to-task mappings” is very useful in providing an annotation system for use in performing bulk mapping of queries to tasks, and it is not taught or suggested in Fries. Therefore, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 3 and 5-14 cannot be anticipated by Fries, and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 15 is directed to a method of aiding a user in performing bulk mapping of queries to tasks to obtain updated training data for training a search component. Claim 15 includes a step of “displaying simultaneously the plurality of query entries in the query log in a manner which associates each of the displayed plurality of query entries with its corresponding suggested best guess task.” While this limitation is different from the above-discussed limitation of independent claim 1, the Office Action addressed these two limitations together. Like the above-discussed claim limitation, this recited claim 15 limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Fries. As noted above, if Fries is interpreted as teaching the simultaneous display of the plurality of query entries in the query log, it still does not teach the entire claim limitation which requires that the plurality of query entries be simultaneously displayed “in a manner which associates each of the displayed plurality of query entries with its corresponding suggested best guess task.” This limitation is useful in performing bulk mapping, as opposed to search component matching of a query to a task. Lacking a teaching or suggestion of this limitation in Fries, independent claim 15 and dependent claims 17-26 cannot be anticipated by Fries. Therefore, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In section 6 of the Office Action, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fries in view of Shanahan et al (U.S. Published Patent Application Document No. 2003/0033288). Claim 13 is dependent on allowable independent claim 1 for the reasons set forth below. Further, Shanahan et al. does not teach or suggest the claim limitations which were shown above to not be taught by Fries. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /John D. Veldhuis-Kroeze/
John D. Veldhuis-Kroeze, Reg. No. 38,354
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

JVK/jme